

27

*Handwritten notes and a signature.*

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 124 Case file # 95-262888.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript not provided.

# INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 9:15 AM (Time), 11/14/00 (Date)

File #: 95-262888

Laboratory #(s): 40827037  
4082051

## Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed	Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>WS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>          </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: \_\_\_\_\_

Testimony Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Pages: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 40827037 Date: Jan 28, 1985  
Laboratory Number: 40827037, 40828051 Date: Feb 11, 1985  
Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ  
Laboratory Number: 40827037  
40828051

Initials: SR

Was any other material reviewed?  Yes  No

252

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letters of 8/21/84 and 8/21/84

### Results of Review

File #: 95-262888 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q4, Q10, Q13, Q22, Q23, Q30,

Q38, Q43, Q51, Q53, Q63, Q67, Q70, Q77, Q79, Q89, K3, K6, K9, K12, K16, K18, K19

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
 Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
 Yes  No  Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- Transcript not available.
- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-262888

#1. The examiner failed to compare the pubic hair recovered from the victim's panties (Q70, Q79) and from the victim's pubic combings (Q77) to the victim's known pubic hair (K16). The notes indicate the pubic hair were compared to the suspect's head hair (K18) instead of the suspect's pubic hair (K19).

There is no documentation concerning the tests used to identify the twine (Q64, Q65, Q93) as being made of flax. The lack of this documentation is scientifically unacceptable.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated, are in pencil and not ink and use abbreviations that are difficult to interpret (such as "M- It dist, It indist, dk dist" and "cut-ssp" to describe some of the characteristics of the hair).

The reported result of the twine being composed of flax is not supported or adequately documented in the notes.

Review completed at: 10:30 AM (Time), 11 / 14 / 2000 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 1.25 hour

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 4 pages.

Steve Roberts  
(Signature)

11-14-2000  
(Date)

Page 3 of 4

Initials: SR

Additional Comments

